Interview Summary	Application No. 09/825,246	Applicant(s) Singh et al.		d.
	Examiner Joyce Tun	g	Art Unit 1637	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):				
(1) <u>Joyce Tung</u>	(3)			
(2) Stephen C. Macevicz	(4)			
Date of Interview Jul 12, 2002				
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes				
Claim(s) discussed:				
Identification of prior art discussed:				
Substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments: 112, second paragraph issues were discussed in SN 09/8 overcome the rejections. The differences between the inverse of the capture ligand appears to distinguish the present of the capture ligand app	25246, 09/825247, (ention and the prior a	09824905, art, Grossma	proposed new c nn et al. were dis	elaims scussed. The
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner	's signature, if re	equired